

scheduled for today, Monday, May 16, 2005. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 627, designating the "Linda White-Epps" Post Office in Hamden, CT (rollcall No. 171); "yea" on H. Res. 266, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day (rollcall No. 172); and "yea" on H.R. 2107, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial and Maintenance Fund Act of 2005 (rollcall No. 173).

#### UPPER HOUSATONIC VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), chairman of the Committee on Resources, for bringing out today and through this House H.R. 938, legislation that establishes the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area and designates a number of other National Heritage Areas as well.

This program of National Heritage Areas is really a wonderful program. The 29 towns that encompass the Upper Housatonic Valley have worked together, their first selectmen, their historic societies, and a very large group of volunteers to inventory the historic, the economic, and the environmental assets of this area. And truly, in my district as in the others, they are unique areas, uniquely important historically and uniquely endowed environmentally.

By having a structure within which they could work together with the technical experts from the Federal level, they have developed a knowledge that enables them to plan and will enable them to strengthen the economy through thoughtful tourism programs. Truly this is a partnership between the Federal Government and very small local governments that will bless every life in the Upper Housatonic Valley and the other Heritage Areas throughout the country.

#### IMPORTANT ISSUES NOT BEING ADDRESSED

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, how disappointing that instead of using the first months of this new Congress to address the important issues facing our Nation, we have spent most of our time on issues that cater to special interests.

Instead of helping retirees by strengthening our pension system, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are seeking to dismantle Social Security. They want to take away the safety net, a safety net that seniors depend on, in favor of giving even more money to Wall Street.

Instead of developing a meaningful energy policy to lessen our dependence

on foreign oil, we spend time on the House floor passing an energy bill that will do nothing to relieve rising gas prices, but instead give tax incentives to big oil and gas companies.

The Republican leadership must stop abusing this body and the people we represent. They are doing it for their own self-interests, and it is time the people take this House back. It is the people's House.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES AND THE COST OF HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, for those Members who are going home and having town hall meetings and meeting with constituents, the one issue that comes up with almost every small business, big business, medium-sized businesses, and it comes up with families and school boards, as well as coming up with representatives of State legislatures, it is the cost of health care.

One of the issues we talk a lot about in Minnesota, because we are so close to the Canadian border, is the difference between what we pay for prescription drugs and what people on the other side of the Canadian border pay for the same drugs.

I have in my hands two boxes of Celebrex. We had a hearing last week in the Committee on Government Reform and I held these up and asked: Can anyone tell me which one of these drugs came from another country and which one came from the United States? Well, the answer is you cannot tell because they are exactly the same. Another question, though, about the Celebrex, is which one is safe? Well, according to the FDA, and now according to the company itself, depending upon the condition you may have with your heart and blood, neither one of them may actually be safe.

What I want to talk a little bit about tonight is the differences between what we pay here in the United States and what they pay in Germany for the same drugs. I have a list here, and we have some pharmacies now around the world who, on a regular basis, will send us via e-mail what the pricing is right then for anyone who walks in off the street to buy the drugs.

Here are a few examples. I am going to talk later about the drug Nexium. You can buy that at the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany, for \$60.25. That same drug, same potency, same everything, made in the same

plant, sells at a local pharmacy in Rochester, Minnesota, for \$145.33.

Look at Prevacid. In Germany, it is \$35.22, American. In the United States it is \$146.47. Zocor. This is an interesting drug. You can walk in off the street with a prescription and you can buy it in Germany, 30 tablets, 10 milligrams, for \$23.83. That same drug in Rochester, Minnesota, will be \$85.

□ 1930

But what I want to talk about is the Germans. Even if we add up 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs, in Germany you can buy all of those for \$455.57. Those same drugs in the United States would be more than double that at \$1,040.04.

That is bad enough, but what makes it even worse is the Germans are looking at cutting the cost that they paid for prescription drugs. Recently, the German health care system announced that they would not pay for Lipitor. Why not? Well, the ministry decided last year it could no longer cover the high prices of some of the branded drugs because they were deemed to have the same medical efficacy as available generics.

The point is even though they are buying Lipitor considerably cheaper than we buy it here in the United States, they still think it is too much and the manufacturers cannot justify the price.

The other story is from The Washington Post where even the Department of Defense is starting to get it right. They are saying they will not reimburse for Nexium except in rare circumstances. Nexium is the new purple pill, and it came out to replace Prilosec. That is why we have to pay so much for these drugs, because these are blockbuster drugs.

The truth of the matter is by their only filings with the FDA, Nexium is not much more effective than Prilosec. As the Department of Defense says in the article, Nexium is not worth the money. It goes on to say it is pretty dubious to pay \$4 a pill for Nexium when over-the-counter Prilosec is 67 cents.

Mr. Speaker, I think Americans ought to have access to world-class drugs. I think we ought to pay our fair share. I think we ought to be willing to subsidize the starving people in sub-Saharan Africa, but I do not think Americans should have to subsidize the starving Swiss. I do not think Americans ought to be forced to pay the world's highest prices for these drugs. No one can tell the difference. These are the same drugs. They come from the same plants; and yet as Members can see, we are paying many times 50, 60, 70 percent more for the same drugs.

I am asking Members to join in this effort by cosponsoring my Pharmaceutical Market Access bill. We have been working on this for several years. It has passed the House a couple of

times. This time I think we can get it past the Senate as well.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

#### SMART SECURITY AND REACHING OUT TO THE MUSLIM WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration has done a woefully inadequate job of reaching out to the Muslim world. To quote an oft-used phrase, "They never seem to miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity."

I believe that fundamentally they fail to understand that most Muslims do not want to blow up Western sites and buildings; they want to live in a free society, one which allows them to worship the God of their choosing and raise their children in safety, much like every American.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration because of this lack of understanding has twisted the September 11 attacks in order to achieve a veritable clash of societies. The President uses phrases like "us versus them" and "you are either with us or against us." Quotes like these cause many non-violent Muslims to oppose the United States as they see a U.S. engaged in a war not against terrorism but against Muslims. They see the United States as a colonial occupier, not as a liberating government.

This has encouraged radical Muslim groups to step up their recruiting and their tactics. The net result is 3½ years after September 11, Americans are much less safe, not safer than they were. Instead of responding by reaching out to the Muslim world to address the root causes of terrorism, deprivation, resource scarcity and lack of educational opportunities, this administration invaded Iraq, a country that was not previously a haven for terrorists and had no relationship whatsoever to the events of September 11.

Regardless, in April 2003, the United States invaded Iraq with the support of a weak coalition of nations. Most countries, even those that fought in the first Gulf War in 1991, chose not to enter the second war in Iraq. They could not legitimize a war based on such faulty and wavering premises as the ones we heard in late 2002 and early 2003.

The war has been a disaster from nearly the beginning. Since April 2003, more than 1,600 American soldiers and at least 24,000 Iraqi civilians have paid for this arrogant foreign policy with

their lives. At least another 12,000 Americans soldiers have been seriously wounded and of course the U.S. has incurred a tremendous financial burden, so far a \$200 billion IOU.

Instead of addressing the threat of future terrorism by engaging the Muslim world through smart national security policies, the Bush administration took the fight to a country that became a terrorist enclave only after the U.S. invaded. It is quite clear that the war in Iraq was the worst possible response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Instead of stopping terrorism, the war has actually hindered our efforts, including any effort to capture Osama bin Laden.

But fortunately, there is another way. Over the last 2 years, I have developed and refined a national security platform called SMART Security. SMART is Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century. Unlike our current policies, it will achieve real results. SMART Security will ensure America's security by reaching out and engaging the Muslim world. Instead of rushing off to war for the wrong reasons, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues.

There is a demonstrated link between debt relief and lack of support for terrorism, which is why the SMART platform will encourage wealthy nations to provide debt relief and developmental aid for the world's poorest countries.

Not every international problem has a military answer; and that is why SMART Security will prevent terrorism, by addressing the very conditions which give rise to terrorism in the first place.

SMART Security also encourages democracy building, human rights education, conflict resolution through nonmilitary means, educational opportunities for women and girls, and strengthening civil society programs in the developing world.

Programs like these are the best way to encourage democracy in countries like Iraq, not through wars that cause thousands of deaths, cost billions of dollars. The SMART approach is a way to reach out to the Muslim world. It is time we stop putting all of our eggs in the military basket and start getting smart about our national security.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### CHARGES DROPPED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my intent tonight was to come to the floor and talk about my opposition to CAFTA, which I think is a bad policy for the future of America.

But tonight I am glad to come to the floor after 4 weeks of coming and talking about Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a Marine who was charged with murder for actions he took as a Marine officer in Iraq over a year ago. I have been on the floor for 4 weeks saying this man should never have been charged. He did his job as a Marine officer. But because of circumstances of a sergeant who did not like the gentleman, he filed charges 2½ months later.

I am pleased to say this past Friday I was notified by the attorney for Lieutenant Pantano that the hearing officer, Major Wynn at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, in my district, has decided that he will recommend these charges be dropped: two charges of premeditated murder that should never have happened. But Major Wynn will now send his recommendations to General Huck who is in Iraq, and it is my hope and prayer that General Huck will agree with the hearing officer and drop these charges.

Mr. Speaker, what has been said about this is Lieutenant Pantano loves America. He had been a soldier during Desert Storm, came back, went back to his home State of New York, went to college and graduated in 3 years. He went into the stock market selling energy stocks making six figures. But shortly after September 11, he felt a passion because he had his brother and sister killed in the Twin Towers by terrorism, so he went back into the Marine Corps and was made an officer.

Shortly after the shooting in Iraq, he was actually recommended for promotion by the officer in charge, that he was competent and a real leader and the type of person that they needed to promote in the Marine Corps. But 2½ months later, a sergeant who was demoted by Lieutenant Pantano weeks before is the one who made the charges 2½ months later. But the good news tonight is that the hearing officer has made a recommendation that the charges of murder be dropped against Lieutenant Pantano.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I had the pleasure to speak with Mary Pantano who stood by her son for months, and I had the pleasure to talk with her. I was convinced, even before I met her son, who is a wonderful man, I would love to have as a son or son-in-law, and she convinced me her son could not have done anything more than what he should have done as a Marine officer.

So tonight, as I begin to close, I thank God Almighty that he has helped the Pantano family, both the mother; wife, Jill; and the two cute boys who are his sons; and also Lieutenant Pantano.

Mr. Speaker, I close tonight by asking God, I think about our men and women in uniform in Iraq and Afghanistan, how difficult it must be for them